Remarks

The present response is to the Office Action mailed the above-referenced case on June 21, 2005. Claims 1-40 are presented for examination. The Examiner rejects claims 1-13, 16-27 and 34-39 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rosset et al (US 6,704,715) hereinafter Rosset. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosset in view of Yamaoka et al. (US 6,149,064) hereinafter Yamaoka. Claims 28-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosset in view of Takeda (US 5,191,644) hereinafter Takeda. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosset in view of Yamaoka.

Regarding independent claim 1, the Examiner states that Rosset teaches a receive interface having at least one light sensor for receiving input information coming from a user electronic apparatus (Col. 5, lines 1-42). The Examiner further states that Rosset teaches applicant's limitation of claim 1 reciting; "wherein during step a), the light sensor of the electronic security device is placed facing the screen of the user electronic apparatus while the screen is caused to emit a modulated light signal carrying the input information (Col. 5, line 40 to col. 6, line 57).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of Rosset's columns 5 and 6, as it is applied to reject claim 1. Applicant has studied columns 5 and 6 of Rosset's specification and fails to find a receive interface having at least one light sensor for receiving input information, nor does the specification teach or suggest that any light sensor of the electronic security device is placed facing the screen of the user electronic apparatus while the screen is caused to emit a modulated light signal carrying the input information. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reference an element number or more specific disclosure teaching said limitations from the reference.

Applicant points that Rosset teaches that the system comprises a card 10, substantially the same size as a credit card in terms of length and width, but not necessarily in terms of thickness, the card being customized by specific identifiers for each card and for each customer. The card 10 comprises emission means, particularly a

loudspeaker 13 emitting short DTMF-type acoustic identification signals 20. These signals are emitted when the customer uses a button 14 accessible from the outside of the card to activate emission means 13 and the devices controlling them. These emission means 13 are excited by a <u>DTMF signal generator 99</u> controlled by a microprocessor 104 powered by a battery 106 and controlled by a resonator 107.

Applicant argues that column 5 and 6 of Rosset merely expands on the acoustic teachings above and clearly fails to disclose a light sensor or a screen emitting modulated light in order to transmit security information between a user's electronic apparatus and an electronic security device as claimed.

Applicant asserts that because Rosset fails to disclose the elements and functionality of those elements, a prima facie rejection has not been made. Applicant believes claim 1 is patentable over the art of Rosset as argued above. Claims 2-40 are therefore patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended from a patentable claim, and the specific rejections made against the other claims are moot.

As all of the claims standing for examination have been demonstrated to be patentable as amended over the art of record, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, and that the present case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this response, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted, Maurice Milgram

Donald R. Boys

Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency P.O. Box 187 Aromas, CA 95004 (831) 726-1457